

F174



AUTUMN, 1959

No. 5 Vol. V

NINEPENCE

FAITH AND UNITY

CONTENTS

Editorial	- - - - -	2
Unity, Division, Reunion. Alfred Schmemann		2
Holy Scripture, The Standard of Faith		
D. L. Popplewell		13
Barriers of Unity. Donald J. W. Bradley	-	18
Seal of the Confessional. Michael Bruce	-	20

THE JOURNAL OF
THE CHURCH UNION COMMITTEE FOR THE DEFENCE OF CHURCH PRINCIPLES
in co-operation with the
JOINT COMMITTEE ON DOCTRINE OF THE AMERICAN CHURCH UNION AND
THE CLERICAL UNION

EDITORIAL

We are omitting our normal editorial comment from this number of *Faith and Unity* in order to provide space for Fr Alexander Schmemmann's article, *Unity, Division, Reunion, in the light of Orthodox Ecclesiology*, which has a particular bearing on the forthcoming discussions between Roman Catholics and members of the Orthodox Churches. This article was originally given as an address to the annual conference of the Fellowship of St Alban and St Sergius, 1950, and appeared the following year in the review *Theologia*. More recently it was published in French, in the Orthodox review *Contacts*. Fr. Popplewell's article, *Holy Scripture, the Standard of Faith*, discusses an expression often used in ecumenical discussion but open to varieties of interpretation. In the winter number of *Faith and Unity* it is hoped to publish information about reactions in India to the Lambeth proposals for the amendment of the North India Plan of Union.

UNITY, DIVISION, REUNION IN THE LIGHT OF ORTHODOX ECCLESIOLOGY

The Theology of Schism — such is the somewhat strange name of a new branch of theology which has grown out of the present-day search for Christian unity. The reasons for its emergence are to be found in the notion of the nature of the Church, which is generally described as "Catholic", a concept which may be described as "horizontal", in contra-distinction to the "vertical" or "protestant" conception. This "Catholic" notion of the Church inevitably leads to the following paradox: any search for reunion presupposes a preliminary agreement as to what unity is. On the other hand, the "Catholic" concept of unity excludes the very possibility of real division, for, if on the one hand this Catholic conception leads us to affirm the organic unity of the Church or, more precisely, to affirm the Church as an organic unity, and if this same organic unity is expressed in the outward structure of the Church and in its historic continuity — division as such, is an obvious contradiction in terms; for in Catholic terminology such a division would signify the division of Christ himself. The "theology of schism" is sometimes put forward as an attempt to find a way out of this specifically "catholic" *impasse*, and to reconcile the theological impossibility of the Church's division with historical reality.

It must be admitted at the offset that contemporary Orthodox theologians are far from having reached any agreement on this matter, and that those views which they have put forward in

recent years on the significance of our divisions often appear to be mutually exclusive. These views range from a complete denial of the existence of any *vestigia Ecclesiae* outside the boundaries of the Orthodox Church, rejecting even the validity of the Sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church, to a kind of justification of the division in Christendom based on the doctrine of Chalcedon. The diversity of these theories, I would suggest, is due to the fact that Orthodox ecclesiology is as yet almost totally undeveloped. The uncertainty of the Orthodox position on this point is a serious setback, for those who would attempt a study of the problem before us today are thereby deprived of premises clearly defined by a consensus of Orthodox theological opinion. For this reason, I cannot attempt more than a very brief outline of a subject which, to be treated exhaustively, would require a large book. My paper, therefore, is but a modest attempt to suggest to you a few topics for reflection which I can only submit to you, in the words of Origen "*gymnastikos*", not as an answer to the problem, but rather as so many *questions* addressed, if I may say so, to the considered opinion of theologians.

II

The question of the unity of the Church has already been discussed from widely different angles at this Conference¹. I will, therefore, confine myself to one aspect of the problem which, it seems to me, is of fundamental importance. It is *the* difference between the Orthodox and Roman Catholic methods of interpreting the *organic* unity of the Church. I refer explicitly to Roman Catholicism because I believe that one of the first tasks of Orthodox ecclesiology is to find a way of freeing itself of certain Roman influences. These influences can be detected in our very notions of the *organic unity* of the Church and, to my mind, they are especially dangerous since their true nature is concealed from a number of Orthodox theologians by the age-long resistance of Orthodoxy to the See of Rome; this resistance has only too often been a substitute for any fundamental discussion of our "ecclesiological differences". At first sight it would seem that the only aspect of the Roman doctrine of the Church that is unacceptable to the Orthodox is the teaching on the Papacy as laid down by the Vatican Council, a teaching regarded as a mere heretical superstructure on a doctrine in all other respects Orthodox. Yet, I believe, it is important to realise that the doctrine of Papal Primacy and, anterior to this dogma, the very existence of Papalism are but a logical consequence of a particular conception of the Church's "*organic unity*". In a simplified form this conception may be defined as follows: in the Roman theology

¹ The paper read at the Conference by Fr Lionel Thornton, C.R., "The Unity of the Church—A Biblical Approach" was printed in "Sobornost" Series 3, N.8, Winter 1950, pp. 324-334.

this organic unity, the Church as an organism, is primarily the Universal Church, that is the totality of the visible Church on earth, which, in the unity of its organization and in its universal structure, is the manifestation and the extension of the Mystical Body of Christ "Un Dieu, un Christ, un baptême, une Eglise institutionnelle et sociétaire", says Fr. Congar¹ and for him this implies a conception of the Church in terms of "parts" and of the "whole", and Roman theology seeks for a definition of the Church in which, according to the same Father Congar, "les différentes parties aient vraiment dans un ensemble qui soit proprement un tout, un statut de parties qui soient proprement des parties".² The universal organism of the Church, as a whole, is ontologically *anterior* to its different parts, and it is only *in* and *through* the "whole" that the "parts" are united to the Church. It seems to me that it is precisely this conception of the unity of the Church, as one visible, universal organism, that postulates a single head—one universal bishop in whom this unity is grounded and fulfilled. Thus, the Church as a universal organism as a "whole", is the Church of Rome—"Ecclesia Sancta, Catholica et Romana", as we read in the Encyclical *Mystici Corporis* "through which we become members of the Body of Christ".

The essential difference between Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism on this point is, as I will attempt to show, vital and relevant to the problem of reunion. The Orthodox view, as it seems to me, may be expressed as follows: the category of organic unity can properly be applied only to a *local Church*. I should like to make clear that by "local Church" I mean not one of those ecclesiastical groupings co-terminous with nations or states, which we call autocephalous Churches (such as the Greek Church or Russian Church), but a single community united under the headship of one bishop and possessing, in unity with him, the fullness of sacramental life. Such a Local Church can alone be called an "organism" in ecclesiastical language and such a Local Church, as an "organism", a sacramental body, is not a "part" or a "member" of a wider universal organism. *It is the very Church itself*. I am aware that in making this statement I am laying myself open to criticism of many Orthodox theologians who tend to conceive of the Church in the very terms of a "universal organism" which are used by the theologians of Rome. Nevertheless I believe that the view I am submitting to you today directly and logically follows from the Orthodox conception of the Church's catholicity. "Catholicity" was the subject of a previous Conference of the Fellowship, and I shall not endeavour to repeat in detail what was said on that

¹ M. J. Congar, *Chrétiens Désunis. Principes d'un "oecuménisme" catholique*. Paris, 1937, p. 109.

² *Ibid.*, p. 241.

occasion.¹ I will only remind you that, in the Orthodox view, "Catholicity" is not the Church's universality, but primarily its *wholeness*, the wholeness of its life always and everywhere. It follows from this definition that such categories as "the parts" and "the whole" are inapplicable to the Church, because the Church is catholic in so far as within it the "part" is not only in agreement with the whole, corresponds to and submits to the whole, but is identical with and embodies the whole: the part, in other words, is the whole. The Church is catholic in time and space. In time, because she is not only always linked to the Apostles "horizontally", but is in fact the *same* Church, the same Apostolic community, gathered ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ (Acts II, 45, 47). It is catholic in space because each local Church, in the unity of the bishop and people receives the fullness of gifts, is taught the entire Truth and possesses the whole Christ; "and where Christ is, there is the Church". "Totus Christus" and therefore "tota Ecclesia". The Apostolic succession which is the basis of the Church's catholicity in time is likewise the basis of her catholicity in space: it signifies that each local Church possesses not a portion of the Apostolic gifts but their fullness. What may be termed the "horizontal" structure of the Church is the prime condition of her catholicity; while her catholicity is the fullness of the Church, always and everywhere, the fullness given to her in Christ which, in the last instance, is but the fullness of Christ himself; "totus Christus, Caput et Corpus".

The unity of the Church cannot be divorced from her catholicity, cannot obey any other law except the law of catholicity, in terms of which the essence of the Church is "l'extension et la plénitude de la Sainte Incarnation, ou plutôt de la Vie Incarnée du Fils avec tout ce que pour notre salut il connut: la Croix et le Tombeau, la Résurrection le troisième jour, l'Ascension dans les Cieux, la Session à la droite du Père".² In other words, the nature of the Church's unity is primarily sacramental, for it is in the Sacraments that the fullness of Christ is ever actualized and we become participants in it, ever sealing, through this *communio in sacris*, our organic unity with one another in Christ's Body and constituting together one Christ. But the very sacramental nature of the Church's unity presupposes the use of "organic" categories with reference to the local Church. The Local Church is that sacramental organism which in its bishop possesses the fullness of Christ, the fullness of unity, of holiness, of catholicity and apostolicity, in fact those very *notae Ecclesiae* which are but the signs of the Church's

¹ Cf. E. Every, "The Catholicity of the Church" in "Sobornost" Series 3, N.6, Winter 1949, pp. 233-238 (an analysis of what had been said at the Conference by the Orthodox and the Anglican theologians) and G. Florovsky, "The Catholicity of the Church" in "The Church of God" (an Anglo-Russian Symposium) London, 1934, pp. 51-74.

² G. Florovsky: L'Eglise: sa nature et sa tâche. In "L'Eglise universelle dans le Dessein de Dieu" vol. 1, 1949, p. 70.

organic unity in Christ: *Caput et Corpus*. A bishop cannot be a bishop of a part of the Church, for his very unity with his own Church is not only the image of the unity of Christ with the Church, the unity of the people of God, but is also the real gift of fullness, actualized eternally in sacraments.

The fatal defect of Roman catholic ecclesiology, from this point of view, is that this organic character of the Local Church as the basis of unity has been transferred to the Church Universal, which has become in fact *one enormous Local Church*, requiring, consequently and naturally, a single bishop as a focus and a source of the fullness of the Church. If the Church is a Universal Organism it must possess *its own* universal bishop just as a Local Church possesses an organic unity in its own bishop. Dom Clément Lialine, in his commentary on the Encyclical *Mystici Corporis*, drops a very significant remark, driving the doctrine of the organic unity of the Universal Church to its extreme conclusions. Commenting on the passage of the Encyclical which deals with the place of the Eucharist in the unity of the Church, Father Lialine remarks: "On pourrait ajouter que l'image du Corps Mystique se réalise parfaitement quand c'est le grand Prêtre de Christ sur terre qui célèbre lui-même le Saint-Sacrifice".¹ No clearer evidence could be found of the fact that the whole theology of the local Church and of its link with the bishop, as expressed for instance in the epistles of St Ignatius of Antioch, has been transposed to the function of the bishop of the Church Universal. But, in the Orthodox view, this transfer signifies that universalism has been substituted for the catholicity of the Church, for its eschatological fullness which enables us always and everywhere "in this world" "to actualize" the whole Christ and to bring the whole Church, in all its fullness and saving power, to the people; and so this transfer would prevent "two or three gathered together" from being the witnesses of the full reality of the Incarnation of the Son of God. It is my firm conviction that, if it were to adopt these categories of a universal organism, Orthodox theology would inevitably lead to Rome. It is indeed impossible to go on maintaining, as the Orthodox frequently do, that, although the Church is a Universal organism, it has no visible Head, for its invisible Head is Christ himself. This assertion is due to a failure to understand the very relationship between the "visible" and the "invisible" within the Church. If the Church is catholic, then its invisible essence is verily present and incarnate in its *visible* nature and its *visible* structure; these are not mere symbols, for the visible Church is verily the body of Christ.

But what then do we mean by the unity of the Churches and what is the nature of the visible unity of the whole Church in the whole world? It is clear that if the Roman concept of the "parts"

¹ Dom Clément Lialine. *Une Etape en Ecclésiologie*. Irénikon 1950, tirage à part.

and the "whole" cannot be applied to this unity, the unity must be ontologically expressed in terms of an *identity*; it follows that the unity of the Churches is just as real as the organic unity of a local Church, which is indeed the Unity of the Church and not merely unity among the Churches. The point is not that all these local churches *together constitute* a single organism, but that each church, as a church, has a sacramental unity, is the *same* Church, manifested in a given place. The identity is based on the identity in the sacramental structure of every Church: on the Apostolic succession, on the episcopate, and on the sacraments. And so we return to the same organic unity of the Church, but in which the churches *are not complementary* to one another, are not "parts" or "members": *each of them and all of them together* are nothing but the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.

III

This, however, is only one aspect of the Church's unity, an aspect which may be termed ontological. Yet, the Church is not only something *given* to men by God in Christ, but it also implies their acceptance and assimilation of this gift, their answer to God's calling and their election. And if *that which is given* is the fullness, always identical with itself, the eschatological fullness of the Church, even Christ himself, it is yet impossible to abstract this fullness from its incarnation and manifestation in history. In this sense catholic ecclesiology is also essentially the *theology of the history of the Church*. I should like to emphasize that I mean the *theology* of the history of the Church and not the *philosophy* of history. The philosophy of history seeks to discover the significance of the historical process, its teleology—and in this sense the only real pattern of a philosophy of history is the sacred history of the Old Testament, the history of Salvation "*Heilsgeschichte*", wholly moving towards its own fulfilment, to the Incarnation of the Son of God. And this history was fulfilled. "But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son" (Gal. IV, 4). In him the fullness of Divinity and the fullness of Salvation are granted to men. The history of Salvation was fulfilled and "the time of the Church" is eschatological: "the last time". From the point of view of *Heilsgeschichte* the Church *has no history*, it is already *in statu patriae*, and is always the actualization of its fullness of salvation accomplished by Christ *hatax*—once for all.

The statement that the Church has a history means that this fullness of salvation is not only *given* to men, but is *accepted* by them, that human nature, restored and renewed through the Incarnation, has become capable of accepting and assimilating Salvation; that historical reality, this world of ours, can actually receive Christ, and our human nature acquire conformity with him. God

became man, the Divine Word became the word of human scriptures, and just as it is impossible to disincarnate Christ, or to separate the Word of God from the word of man, so it is impossible to abstract the eschatological fullness of the Church from its historical and human manifestation. The theology of the history of the Church presupposes that in history, in the changing and limited world, it is possible adequately to comprehend, express and assimilate Divine Truth which is granted in Christ. Thus, from a purely historical point of view, the history of the Church, like any other history, is contingent. For instance, the structure of the early Church was shaped by the world in which it was born, and the dogmatic formulae of the Oecumenical Councils, the very doctrine of the Church and the development of its organization, were determined by purely historical factors. But the nature of the Church is such that all that is Divine, absolute and "eschatological" in it can be expressed in these "historical" forms, and what is purely historical can be transfigured and made to conform with Truth. More than this: this is a task set before the Church. Just as each of us, who has received in baptism the fullness of the gifts of salvation, has become "a participant in the death and Resurrection" of our Lord, and has found a new life, is called to grow in it, so does the Church "till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ". (Eph. IV, 13.)

The notion of the organic unity of eschatology and history within the Church provides the key to the true understanding of the *Church's Tradition*. On the one hand the Orthodox Church rejects the theory of "the development of dogma" regarded as a kind of quantitative enlargement of Truth: the fullness of Truth is given to the Church from the very beginning and in its entirety, is transmitted to the Church always and everywhere. "Quod semper quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est". It is not the truth that grows, it is we who grow in the truth. But, on the other hand, this growth is not simply a series of historical and relative apprehensions of one and the same Truth but an actual and adequate reply to the summons of God, the fruit of the Incarnation and of the Holy Spirit; and so it becomes an integral part of the Church's life and is transmitted as such by Tradition. This is no mere "explicitation" of some basic "kernel" of Tradition, exterior to it and only of "historical" value: it is Tradition itself, the very Truth, manifested and expressed. In this sense Tradition for us includes the Scriptures which form its foundation and content, and the dogmatic formulae and the holiness of the saints and the veneration of the Mother of God and the whole teaching and the whole life of the Church.

And so the true sign and condition of the unity of all the

Churches, that is of the whole Catholic Church is *the unity of Tradition*, which is that adequate interpretation of the Church's eschatological fullness which alone permits us to comprehend and manifest our unity in Truth, in real and objective Truth, not merely in a pale, relative and "historical" expression of it. These, it may be objected are human words and human beliefs and human truths. But we must not forget that the word "human" has acquired two different meanings since the day when God became man and has remained man: it may mean the total sum of human weakness, sin and the falling away from God; it can also signify the deified and glorified humanity of Christ: "ye are the Body of Christ" (I Cor. XII, 27), "we have the mind of Christ" (I Cor. II, 16) "yet, not I, but Christ liveth in me." (Gal. II, 20): these words, spoken by a man could be said by the Church of itself. And for this reason its Tradition, its faith and its Truth, received and witnessed by the Holy Spirit, are the true expression of its unity. Our unity in Christ cannot be otherwise manifested by us than in this "unity of faith and love" and it is thus that St Ignatius of Antioch defines the Church. The eschatological unity of the Church, its identity in time and space, is manifested in the actual *historical and visible* unity of faith; and the criterion of this faith is, again, the *historical tradition* of the Church. Arianism, Monophysitism, Nestorianism were fourth and fifth century Oriental heresies; yet the dogmas, that were formulated by the Church as a reply to these heresies are not merely fourth or fifth century Oriental dogmas. They are the very *Catholic Truth*, the words of the Holy Spirit in the Church, and this Truth cannot be a relative one. To enter into the Church, to live in the Church is not merely to achieve an individual and eschatological union with Christ: it implies the necessity of entering into and living in the historical Church which possesses its own language and its own historical form, of accepting this history as one's own history; and far from dragging the Catholic Truth down to the level of one's own time and personal needs, this act implies a constant widening of one's personality, one's faith and one's language towards the goal of full Catholicity.

To sum up, the unity of the Church is expressed and realized in the unity of faith, manifested in the full *Catholic agreement* of all the Churches; through this agreement each Church *knows* the others as it does itself and in the others it knows the One Catholic Church. It is this Catholic agreement that find its expression in communion, in the sacraments, in intercommunion; through it the sacraments of another Church are recognized as the sacraments of the Church Universal. The Church is not a universal organism, yet its faith is always the universal faith, the faith of the Apostles,

the Fathers and Doctors; it is a visible unity, the unity of the Catholic Church throughout the earth.¹

IV

It seems to me that I can now venture to draw several conclusions regarding the attitude of the Orthodox Church towards the fact of division and the meaning it attaches to the idea of "reunion".

It should be noted at the offset that the attitude of the majority of contemporary theologians to the fact of division is very different from the attitude of the Eastern Church at the time of the Oecumenical Councils and in Byzantium. It may be said that contemporary theologians seek above all to discover the meaning of division and wish paradoxically to determine what might be called the *theological status of division*. How is division possible, what happens to the Sacraments in a Church or a community separated from what is supposed to be the true Church, what is the validity of their orders—these are the questions raised today. It seems to me that all these questions, which "a theology of schism" attempts to answer, are fundamentally connected with the Roman conception of the Church as one universal organism and can arise only out of Roman presuppositions. A theology is a product of the desire of theologians to find a place for the Church where, according to their own presuppositions, there should be no place for her. But the whole trouble is that, from the Orthodox point of view, these questions are unanswerable, because the whole problem is falsely posited and formulated in the wrong terms. This may best be proved by the fact that neither the early Church nor the Church of the period of the Oecumenical Councils ever raised these questions, and in contemporary Orthodox theology they are a product of Roman and, generally, Western influence.

For the Byzantine Church division meant the falling away of one or several local Churches from catholic agreement and, consequently, from the *true faith* expressed in and through this agreement, not, would I repeat, a separation from a universal organism, nor the breaking away from Eastern Church, regarded in some sense of the word as the *source of the Church*, but the violation of Tradition and Truth. But in so far as the Church

¹ I do not, of course, wish to deny the visible organization of the Universal Church, the grouping of local Churches into provinces, metropolitan areas and patriarchates; the primacy of certain episcopal sees; in brief, that whole ecclesiastical order (*taxis*) which is sanctioned by the canons of the Church. My point is simply that this organization is not an organism as understood by the Church of Rome, but is *historical* by its very nature—changing in accordance with the historical process.

It changes in such a way as always to express the catholic agreement of the whole Church and her real identity with every local Church. Cf. my brief essay: "The Ecumenical Patriarch and the Orthodox Church" in the "Messenger of the Russian Church in Western Europe". No. 1 (28) 1951, pp. 3-12 (in Russian).

manifests and recognizes her ontological identity in this unity of Tradition, in this manifested Truth, and the unity of faith is a condition of this identity, the violation of catholic agreement interrupts the communion in the Sacraments. For the Roman Church division is precisely a breaking off of communion with Rome, because Rome is the *source* of the Church and the source of her visible of unity. The term "*Romana*" is in fact a *nota ecclesiae*, which includes the *notae* of apostolicity, unity and catholicity. But for the Eastern Church such a *nota ecclesiae*, in the absence of which she can recognize neither apostolicity, for unity and catholicity is not the East but "*Orthodoxy*"—the fullness of tradition and genuine unity in faith. This signifies that, when one or several local Churches fall away from catholic agreement, the Orthodox Church cannot raise the problem as to their "validity" as Churches, because outside the fullness of tradition, outside the manifested truth which is Orthodoxy, we cannot "know" "acknowledge" (or recognize) this validity. Tradition, in this sense, is that which permits us to truly apprehend and receive what God did for us, truly receive the Mystery of our salvation; and hence outside this Tradition we simply *know* nothing of "validity" or "invalidity".

To cite an example: when the late Patriarch Sergius of Moscow and several other Orthodox theologians expressed the opinion that the question of the validity of Anglican orders cannot be solved by the Orthodox Church without general dogmatic agreement, they meant, I believe, precisely this: that for us the problem of "validity" is inseparable from that of right "interpretation", since this "interpretation" is the acceptance of the validity of Salvation, achieved once and for ever. And this adequate interpretation is the Tradition of the Church, expressed in Catholic agreement.

This explains the fact, which I have already mentioned, that the Byzantine Church, in her polemics with the Western Church, invariably raised the problem not in terms of a re-attachment of the Western Church, to her, or of a natural recognition of sacrament or ecclesiastical organization, but purely on the plane of dogma on which the Western Church violated the Truth and fell away from Catholic agreement: the Filioque, etc. This was so because it is only in dogmatic agreement, more precisely in agreement in faith, that the Sacraments of another local Church can be acknowledged by us, and the Sacraments of our Church, in other words this Church can be acknowledged as the same Church. In the last resort, *dogmatic agreement* is a necessary criterion of acknowledgment of another Church, as being the same Church; without this criterion the external unity of the Church ceases to express her "ontological" unity. It follows from this that though the Orthodox Church cannot have any "theology of schism", because something negative cannot be interpreted

positively, and consequently "justified", yet she *knows* the true conditions for reunion and the way that leads to it. I shall not disclose anything new in saying that this way can only be the way of dogmatic unity, of a true dogmatic agreement. This dogmatic agreement, in the light of what I have said implies not only an agreement, on specific points, a certain artificially defined dogmatic minimum, but an integration of the "historical fullness" of Tradition. Our divisions were primarily the result of a break in catholic agreement, of ecclesiastical parochialism and of a limitation in men's experience of the Church. And the call of the Orthodox Church back to the Fathers and to the Councils is a call not to the East or to *Herself*, but to that very fullness and genuine catholicity of the Church's experience which both Fathers and Councils were able to express. Our first task is to discover the *language of the Church*, without which formulae and definitions may be introduced into the Creed but cannot become the true *content* of our faith.

In practice this means that dogmatic unity is impossible without a measure of *doctrinal* unity. Dogmatic unity is the beginning of an endless growth into "the fullness of unity" and in this process of growth all those tensions between different schools and doctrines which have always existed in Christendom are legitimate and even necessary. But may I emphasize once more that dogmatic unity cannot be achieved without a measure of "integration" of the Church's history, of her historical experience. We must once more follow the course of the Church's history, experience anew this history as *our* history; her "past" must come to life and become our actual present; It must become the basis and expression of our unity in the Church and hence of the unity of the Church itself. The Church is one because the Church is unity. Someone has remarked during this Conference that the essential difference between "catholics" and "protestants" lies not in a different approach to the Bible, to the Church, etc., but in the fact that in the last resort, though we have one Bible and the same historical fact of salvation, we believe in different Jesus Christs. In the last resort, the entire tradition of the Church is but an answer to the question: Who was, who is Jesus from Nazareth? And only in *Tradition*, in the full experience and life of the Church we acquire—not a portion or an aspect of the Gospel, not a "biblical doctrine" on this or that particular point,—but the *whole Gospel*, the whole Mystery of Salvation which is announced in it and ever dwells in all its fullness in the Church. For this reason the unity of Tradition is not a condition or consequence of the Church's unity, it is indeed the *visible unity of the Church*. This unity of tradition determines the unity of the Church's outward structure, but only in it does this unity of structure become actual and valid. Thus neither apostolic succession nor the episcopate, nor the Sacraments can in themselves

be recognized as the foundation of unity, but only that faith of the Church manifested in tradition, which bestows on this entire structure its true significance and "comprehends" its "validity".

In conclusion, I would suggest that an arduous and possibly a long road lies before us,—the road that leads to the "integration" of the Universal and Catholic Tradition of the Church. Every attempt to shirk this road, to find a kind of "eschatological" unity outside its "adequate" historical manifestation will lead not to true unity but to a purely human makeshift unity and to the disincarnation of the Church. And only if we advance along this road the words "reunion with Orthodoxy"—which, in essence, expresses what I have attempted to say, will no longer seem to our Western brethren a manifestation of human pride, and will be revealed to us as the only possible end of the road and the true completion of the journey.

Alexander Schmemmann.

HOLY SCRIPTURE, THE STANDARD OF FAITH

It is normally assumed that in practical questions of reunion the difficulties will arise over questions of order rather than questions of faith. To express the general agreement in faith, appeal is made to Scripture as "the supreme standard of faith", "the primary norm of the Church's teaching". Sometimes, as at Lund in 1952, the expression is amplified to accommodate the Orthodox—"either the sole authority for doctrine, or the primary and decisive part of those authorities to which they would appeal". These formulae give rational ground for a moderate optimism, resting upon several contemporary movements of thought: the great revival of biblical studies, now moving into its second century, and which in the last thirty years has spread to the Roman Church; the renewed appreciation of dogma, which in the same period has saved Protestantism from a laid-slide into ethical rationalism and theosophy; the pastoral and apologetic need, which has demanded that theology be revived by a re-integration of departmentalised theologies; the renewed interest in the doctrine of the Church. There is a genuine and justified feeling that we are beginning to move together, and that the basis for this is the Scriptures which are common to all, the primary, even if not the only standard of the faith.

Still, Jehovah's Witnesses would make the same claim, so that we have not found a formula so clear and lucid as to put an end to all discussion. What are the Scriptures, and in what sense are they to be taken as the standard of faith? The mediaeval

scholastic position, as represented by St Thomas, was that in theology only arguments drawn from the literal sense of scripture could be used *proprie et ex necessitate*; recourse to the doctors of the Church gives only a probable argument, which cannot have the certainty of divine faith. The Anglican Articles follow him in this, and are quite clear as to what Holy Scripture is—"those canonical books of the Old and New Testaments, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church"—the canon, in short, as formulated in the 2nd and 3rd centuries, when the criterion was those Christian writings accepted by the local churches as of apostolic authorship. The authorship was the test. No doubt the content did influence the choice, and one was readier in believing that a book had been written by St John if one thought it was the sort of book St John ought to have written; nevertheless, the Pastorals and II Peter were included, as of apostolic authorship, while I Clement and the Shepherd of Hermas, though highly thought of, were excluded, since everyone knew they had not been written by apostles. As the Old Testament was Spirit-breathed Scripture, so was the New Testament that was set up beside it; and the guarantee was not that the content was inspiring, but that they were the words (however rambling and disconnected) of men known to be inspired. As such the Canon was accepted both by the schoolmen and the Reformers, with the exception of Luther. Clear, therefore, as to what Scripture was, they were clear too as to how it should be applied: it contains a large number of propositions, and both these and the logical deductions from them have the guarantee of absolute divine truth. This late mediaeval outlook is now perpetuated by the Biblical Fundamentalists, led to the setting up in 1948 of the International Council of Churches in explicit opposition to the Oecumenical Movement, and is a major source of Christian disunity.

The formal disagreement between the Council of Trent and the Protestants was not concerned, as is sometimes supposed, with the ecclesiastical traditions (to which Trent attached no certain authority) but with the "unwritten apostolic traditions, delivered to the Apostles either by Christ himself or by the Holy Spirit". Nobody doubted that there had been such traditions, since nobody supposed that the New Testament contained everything which Christ had said to the Apostles; but while the Protestants maintained that such traditions could no longer be discerned and could therefore be left out of account, Trent maintained that they "were delivered by those same apostles as it were from hand to hand, and have come down even unto us". It never claimed that *all* traditions were apostolic, and (after having taken a vote on the matter) refrained from specifying which traditions were apostolic.

On the Protestant side, the question still was not solved. Scripture was clearly not written by the apostles with the conscious

intention of committing to writing a basic outline of the apostolic tradition. It is a collection of *ad hoc* compositions, a complicated, bewildering and apparently self-contradictory collection of oracles *until it is interpreted*. "Scripture" as Professor Skydsgaard insists (Scottish Journal of Theology, 1956) "has a centre and a circumference." Its interpretation depends upon what you fix on as the centre and what you dismiss to the periphery. Rome had found its clue in the Petrine Commission, Luther in justification by faith, Calvin in the doctrine of election. Neither does Scripture always answer the questions that Christians want to ask: a living religion demands a systematic theology, and each of these interpretations of Scripture produced its scholastic system, getting further and further from Scripture as it argued logically from the centre and forgot to check from the periphery. Therefore "Biblical theology" appeared in the 16th century, not as a synonym for Protestant systematic theology nor as a substitute for it, but as a distinct discipline intended to check its more obvious extravagances. During the 19th century, with the application of quasi-scientific and historical methods to scripture criticism, this discipline ceased to rank as a 'theology'; its aim was rather to find an original and essential Gospel free of all theological interpretations, Catholic, Protestant or Pauline, 19th century, 16th century or 1st century. This attempt to uncover "the historical Jesus" is now usually held to have failed. The Jesus produced for inspection has turned out to be just a first-century Jew, sometimes nice and normal, sometimes suffering from typical eschatological delusions, but always inadequate to explain the known fact of the transformation of late Judaism into the new and dynamic force of Christianity, having as little real significance for Christianity as Joseph Smith for the Mormons.

What analytic criticism did do was to leave a number of new problems and destroy a number of old ones. The neat distinction between Scripture and tradition disappeared. The New Testament was found to consist entirely of tradition—everything comes to us interpreted and mediated by the early Church, and there is no way of getting back behind that interpretation. It has thus left us with the question of how much of Scripture we can appeal to as the standard of faith, and how much we must write off as corrupt ecclesiastical tradition. The marking of G.C.E. scripts on Biblical knowledge is here a most illuminating exercise: the canonical writers were so quaint about miracles and demons and such-like things, and puffed the most ordinary happenings up into supernatural signs. It is not so very long ago that eschatology, before it was exalted to its present honourable position, was somilarly part of the "Jewish old clothes" that we had to unwrap before we could get to the essential gospel.

What are we to do? If we go the whole hog and call it all corrupt ecclesiastical tradition, we are left with Dr Bultmann sternly commanding us to choose Christ, but telling us nothing of the content of this Christ whom we are to choose. Let us follow instead Dr Cullmann, who says "There is an apostolic tradition which is a norm because it rests upon eye-witnesses chosen by God", and therefore "the human element is reduced to the inevitable minimum inherent in the very notion of a divine revelation to man" (Scottish Journal of Theology, 1953). That this might continue as a norm for future ages, the Apostles wrote it down and the early Church canonised it. But does this not depend on two theses neither of which command general support—that the Apostles had this conscious intention, and that the early Church was invariably right in its ascriptions of apostolic authorship? If we are going to say that God moved them to write down all the important bits (though they had no such conscious intention); or that the Pastorals (though not written by St Paul and 2nd century) are a standard of faith, but not the Epistles of Ignatius, because the first were included in the canon but not the second, then let us go back to the old-fashioned doctrine of inspiration. It strains the credulity no more, and is not so messy. Or ought we instead to agree with Professor Evans (Theology, December, 1957) that "The Bible is now as it were open at both ends. Emerging from a mist of legend at one end, and departing into a haze of apostolic pseudonymity at the other, the canon of scripture can hardly be taken by us with that deadly seriousness with which our forefathers have taken it".

Can we cut through all this and go back to Luther: What urges Christ is scripture though written by Judas, and what does not urge Christ is not scripture though written by an apostle. This is bringing us back to tradition, for it supposes that you do not read Scripture to have Christ urged on you without having some prior knowledge or experience of what urges Christ. Scripture is written for the Christian, by the Church for the Church—that is the other great throw-up of the biblical movement. We must cease thinking in terms of proof-texts, and allow Scripture to speak to us as a whole, as a unity in diversity, the one great act of God in Christ refracted in a necessary variety of images. But again the same problem arises—where is the centre of this unity and are we sure we have grasped it? The present confidence of 'Biblical Theology' arises largely from a conviction that Professor Dodd had put his finger on the formal centre of unity—the apostolic *kerygma* as distilled from the speeches in Acts. But already this has been questioned—why this selection of speeches? How much do the speeches owe to Luke's editing? Can we identify the deposit handed on to the Church with the content of missionary preaching to the still unconverted? It is claimed also that eschatology can be

used as the key, now recovered from the periphery and installed at the centre. This is not because eschatological references hitherto unknown have just been discovered, but because we have begun to see more clearly what the eschatological references implied to the first century. Is it not reasonable to suppose that in thirty years' time we shall have restored something else from the periphery to the centre—the apostolic right of maintenance, shall we say, and the alms to the Churches; or the conception and use of the divine 'Name'—as we see what these also implied to the first century?

We must have the *Sitz-im-Leben*, as the Form Critics say; but their efforts to provide it have been characterized by other biblical scholars as "imaginary case-histories of anonymous Christians", and as historical reconstructions they are fascinating rather than convincing. "It begins to look as if the New Testament is like an iceberg, four-fifths submerged and one-fifth visible. We are aware of the existence of the four-fifths submerged, though we do not know precisely what it is". (C. F. Evans, *Theology*, December, 1957.) Canon Balmforth, similarly, urged that in addition to Dodd's dual formula of *kerygma* and *didache*, we should allow for another category, *latreia*. How they worshipped would tell us a lot about what things meant to them, and as to how they worshipped there is nothing but scattered and confusing hints. You cannot account for the liturgical worship of the early Church by any *prima facie* reading of the New Testament texts, for it is more probable that the form of the New Testament eucharistic texts has been governed by the liturgical development than vice versa: yet it is unreasonable to suppose that they elaborated it without any hints from the apostles.

When the Fathers say at some times that Holy Scripture contains everything necessary to salvation, and at other times that it is useless without the tradition, do they mean by this anything more mystifying than that it contains all you need to *read* if you were properly brought up—brought up, that is, with the right attitudes hammered in by the regular Christian *praxis*. St Irenaeus denies that there were any secret, esoteric unwritten traditions of the kind claimed by the Gnostics; but this does not mean that there was not a tradition, a way of life, of worship, devotion and behaviour, so public and (to contemporaries) so obvious and unquestionable that it never occurred to anybody to want it written down. There is no difficulty in supposing such a living tradition of response to be apostolic, and the Council of Trent may well be found to have had ultimate right on its side.

This would by no means deliver us over bound into the hands of ecclesiastical traditions. If it is only the living tradition which provides what Irenaeus would have called an *hypothesis* and Athanasius the *skopos ekklesiastikos*, the proper assumptions and

presuppositions, it is only Scripture which can bring a living tradition out of traditions. "When the Church's tradition (both in the Catholic and in the Protestant Church) is illumined by Scripture . . . then something happens in tradition. Then *the* tradition comes to life and many "traditions (which appear very important, perhaps, today) die a natural death" (Prof. Skydsgaard, *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 1956). The same sentiment has been echoed by modern Roman Catholic writers. The essential disagreement between them concerns not the nature of the Scriptures but the nature of the Church—the so-called (and it would seem misnamed) vertical and horizontal ecclesiologies.

There is thus an astonishing variety of ways in which it is possible sincerely to regard Scripture as the standard of the faith. Not only are all of them held at the present moment in varying degrees by some who call and profess themselves Christians: they co-exist within different communions, and often within the mind of one and the same man, who will argue as a rationalist but pray as a fundamentalist, call in inspiration at one moment and disown it at the next, refuse to be bound by the chains of ecclesiastical tradition on one point, but assume it as the unexamined basis of his belief on the next. Holy Scripture as the standard of faith—the formula is one of hope rather than of achievement: it does not abolish or solve doctrinal disagreement, but does open up the lines along which it may be resolved.

D. L. Popplewell.

BARRIERS TO UNITY

Ed. Michael Bruce. (*Faith Press*, Price 15s.)

This stimulating symposium constitutes the first-fruits of the International League for Apostolic Faith and Order (ILAFO) and comprises a series of papers all but one of which were read at a conference of this body held at Pulborough in 1957. The contributors are all concerned to approach the problem of Church Unity with Catholic presuppositions in mind. It is felt that the World Council of Churches is dominated by a Protestant rather than Catholic view-point and that the Catholic approach to ecumenical problems often fails to make itself adequately felt in that quarter. The Catholicism which seeks to assert itself in these papers as a factor in ecumenical discussions is, of course, of the non-Roman kind, as exemplified by the Old Catholic Church and the Eastern Orthodox Church and by some strata of the Anglican Communion and the Churches of the Reformation on the Continent.

The contributors deal with some of the main subjects of controversy between Catholics and Protestants, e.g., Church order, Church discipline (the sacrament of penance) and the doctrine of

the Eucharist. Dr Rinkel, the Old Catholic Archbishop of Utrecht, opens the symposium with a masterly paper on "The Church: the basic problem of Ecumenical Discussion", in which he gets down to the grass roots of the Catholic-Protestant dichotomy. For him the Church is an integral part of the Gospel, not an optional extra, and the tradition of the Church requires a degree of veneration which breeds a characteristically Catholic humility and sets a term to irresponsible individualism. Fr Rodzianko, writing from the Eastern Orthodox standpoint, is equally insistent on the importance of a corporate apprehension and experience of religion and makes the validity of local Church action dependent on its microcosmic relationship to total Church action. Fr Green and Fr Greenacre, both Anglicans, deal with the Eucharist as Sacrifice and as the classical locus of the Lord's presence with his Church. Fr Green shews how the reinterpretation of the Roman Church's traditional teaching on the sacrifice of the Mass by de la Taille, Vonier and Masure has rendered this teaching more acceptable to the Churches of the Reformation with their proper concern for safeguarding the uniqueness and all-sufficiency of the Sacrifice on Calvary. The sequel to the Death of the Victim on Calvary is the eternal offering of the sacrificed Life by the Lamb "slain from the foundation of the world" in the heavenly places and it is this eternal offering which the members share with their Head in the Eucharist on earth. Fr Greenacre is no less concerned than Fr Green with the fatal legacy of late medieval Catholicism, with its nominalist tincture, which has warped both Catholic and Protestant apprehensions of the Eucharistic presence since the Reformation. Dr Baar, in his turn, shews how the desuetude of the practice of sacramental confession in Protestantism has, in fact, impaired the witness of Protestantism to some of its most distinctive tenets, notably the centrality of the Cross. Pastor Gerritsen of the Dutch Reformed Church sees a theological understanding of episcopacy as the essential prelude to a genuine recovery of Catholicity in the Reformed Churches.

The paper which confers a special distinction on this slim volume is Dr Mascall's on "The Sacraments of non-episcopal bodies". These sacraments are defective, he argues, simply because they are not designed to achieve what the Catholic intends his sacraments to achieve. The Protestant thinks of a sacrament as a means of sanctifying the individual recipient, whereas the Catholic thinks of his sacraments as the normal means of building up the Body of Christ. This the Protestant cannot achieve through his sacraments since, lacking a cohesive ministry, his sacraments are exclusively local rather than universal in their reference. "The fundamental defect in sacraments of the non-episcopal bodies is that they are not adequately integrated into the Body of Christ and the only way in which they can be so integrated is by their ministry being ordained

into the apostolic ministry". The implication is that Protestant sacraments are relatively effective in relation to local Christian communities but not absolutely effective in relation to the Universal Church for which they have no necessary significance.

The main value of this book is that it serves to isolate the main issues of the classical controversy and avoids non-essentials. The Church, in the view of all its contributors, is to be taken seriously as a supernatural society with a divinely-sanctioned mission and a real capacity for implementing it. The Church's continuing activity is not parallel but integral to the classical "sacred history" as it is normatively presented in Holy Scripture. An authority is thus conferred upon the developing life of the Church which it would otherwise lack. God has committed himself to the Church through the Incarnation in a more unreserved way than the Protestant is willing to bargain for. The Catholic may, perhaps, be criticised for appropriating God to the Church to an extent which reduces his ultimate transcendence but, if the Catholic is prepared to acknowledge this penitentially, the Protestant must be no less ready to confess that his excessive safeguards against unqualified divine immanence in the Church are calculated to reduce the Church to a non-entity. The ultimate nemesis of an unmitigated Protestantism is the kind of secularism which now dismally characterises so many of the lands where the Reformation was most thorough-going. The spiritual life is a precarious, brittle achievement at best but it evaporates altogether where there is no firm and cohesive ecclesiastical structure to sustain it. It is such a structure that Catholicism, with its clearly-defined episcopal and sacramental system, provides and it is reassuring for the future of Christendom that there is now so widespread a realisation in some quarters at least of the Churches of the Reformation that their basic Catholic heritage must be reaffirmed in the ecumenical debate. The extent of this realisation is impressively indicated by the volume under review.

Donald J. W. Bradley.

THE SEAL OF THE CONFESSIONAL

At the last session of Convocation, the following resolution was passed: "That this House reaffirms as an essential principle of Church doctrine that if any person confess his secret and hidden sin to a priest for the unburdening of his conscience, and to receive spiritual consolation and absolution from him, such a priest is strictly charged that he do not at any time reveal or make known to any person whatsoever and sin so committed to his trust and secrecy." This was passed by a unanimous vote both in the House of Bishops and in the House of Clergy. The proctors for the clergy are elected by proportional representation, which ensures at least in the larger dioceses that minority groups get their share of repre-

sensation. So a unanimous vote means that what is passed has the support of all shades of churchmanship. Actually, in this case, there was quite a long debate before the vote was taken. The reason for this was the insistence by "Low Church" Evangelicals that they were as much bound by the terms of the resolution as their Anglo-Catholic brethren, even if they did not use the form of absolution for private confession given in the Prayer Book, as Anglo-Catholics always do. This led to some confusion, for some Anglo-Catholics assumed that this meant that they were interpreting the resolution as applying to all confidential conversations. In the end it was made clear that everyone considered that it could and should apply to any private confession of sin to a priest, in whatever form the priest absolves and assures the penitent of God's forgiveness.

There are, of course, many other people besides clergymen—lawyers, doctors, psychiatrists, and probation officers, for example—who are frequently entrusted with confidences and, in most cases, it would be quite wrong for them to hand on such confidences to anyone else. Confession to a priest, however, is quite different from any of these, for the confession is not really to the priest but to God. The priest is only the agent God employs to help the penitent feel that he has really confessed and to assure him of his forgiveness.

Naturally, like the other people mentioned, a priest is frequently entrusted also with the same sort of confidences as they are, and perhaps because he is so accustomed to the absolute nature of the Seal of Confession, he is particularly careful to treat all confidences as confidential.

The Seal and the Law

It was a pity that after passing this really important resolution with such impressive unanimity, the debate was allowed to continue on the trivialities of a legal quibble. As so often happens, however, the debate on the less important matter got most of the newspaper comment. Lawyers are divided as to whether the law of the land in theory protects the sanctity of the Seal. In practice no English law court ever attempts to make a priest break the Seal. Were one to do so, the priest would refuse, but as they never do and never have, the point is a purely theoretical one. It would never have arisen were it not that the Convocations are not allowed by the state to make canons that are contrary to the statute law, and some lawyers maintain that, though in practice the situation would never arise, the law of England does not protect a priest from a charge of contempt of court should he refuse as a witness to reveal what was told him in confession, and therefore, a canon forbidding him to do so would be improper. Other lawyers maintain that not merely in practice, but also in theory, the English law respects the Seal.

The Good Name of the Law of England

What is at stake here is not really a Church matter, but the

reputation of the Law of England in the world today. At present English law is regarded with immense respect all over the civilised world. The attempt by the Gestapo to force priests into breaking the Seal in Norway and other countries still stinks in the nostrils. The secret police of the Communists, at their worst, have likewise tried and failed to break the sanctity of the Seal. These are not the bed-fellows we would choose for the Law of England.

The sanctity of the Seal is not a privilege of the clergy. It is the privilege of the man who confesses his sin to God. The penalty, if a priest broke the Seal, used in Swedish law to be death: now, as in Norwegian law, the penalty is deprivation of his office. Whether any priest has ever incurred these penalties I greatly doubt, but the law stands as a witness to how these countries regard the Seal. Swiss and Bavarian law likewise protect the sanctity of the Seal. If the lawyers who say that British law does not do so are right, then it is time this defect was rectified.

Perhaps the following example from one of the 35 states out of 52 jurisdictions in the United States where the sanctity of the Seal is protected, not just by custom, but by a specific statute, might serve as a model. "A clergyman or other minister of any religion shall not, without the consent of the party making the confession, be allowed to disclose a confession made to him in his professional character, in the course of discipline enjoined by the rules or practice of the religious body to which he belongs; nor shall a clergyman or other minister of any religion be examined as to any communication made to him by any person seeking religious or spiritual advice and/or comfort or his advice given thereon in the course of his professional character without the consent of such person."

In the meantime, the secrecy of the confessional remains, as it always has been, absolute.

Michael Bruce.

CHURCH RENEWAL IN SWEDEN

The Working Committee for Church Renewal, which met in Hjelmseryd in November 1958 in order to discuss the situation in the Church, arising out of the Kyrkomöte (Church Congress) of 1958, hereby presents the following declaration as a guidance for organizations and private persons within the Church Renewal Movement.

We first of all adhere to the reservation which was presented at the Kyrkomöte of 1958 by 22 delegates against the decision of that Kyrkomöte to admit women to the order of priesthood. It runs as follows:

According to the Confession of the Church of Sweden, established in its Canon Law, Holy Scripture is the principal norm of the Church. We refer to the beginning of the Formula of Concord (a Lutheran Confession from 1577): "We believe, teach and confess

that the rule and norm from which all doctrines as well as teachers ought to be proved and judged, is the prophetic and apostolic scriptures of the Old and New Testament alone." Holy Scripture is "the pure and clear word of God". Scripture is the testimony of Christ, valid for all times, according both to the proper testimony of Scripture itself and to the doctrine of the Bible, given in the authorities of the Lutheran Confession. Whatever Christ, the Lord and the centre of Scripture, has through the Bible instituted and expressly commanded, is obligatory on the doctrine and life of the Church, and also on its order.

We shall also believe, teach and confess this in the future, as we have done until now. We therefore are obliged to declare that the decision made today by the Kyrkomöte to admit women to the order of priesthood is contrary to Holy Scripture and to the Confession of our Church.

Adhering to this we further declare that:

We confess our intention to remain faithful to the doctrine, belief and practice of the Catholic Apostolic Church, as these are founded on Scripture, preserved in the tradition, and testified to in the Confession of our Church.

We are therefore obliged to protest against the decision of the Kyrkomöte of 1958 to admit women to the order of priesthood. This decision conflicts with the institution of Christ, as we know it from Holy Scripture, and as it has been administered by the unbroken tradition of the Catholic Church during nearly 2,000 years; which tradition has also been fully accepted in the reformed Confessions.

We are thus obliged to declare, that the ordination of a woman to priesthood in lacking approval from the Lord of the Church is an invalid action. We must also state, that the Kyrkomöte has exceeded its authority. The Kyrkomöte has no authority against the word of God.

We are obliged in this connexion to reject the teaching which holds that we are bound to the word of Christ only where it is a question of promises (of salvation) and the teaching which holds that through the justification by faith we are freed from obedience to the commandments of Scripture. These teachings open disquieting perspective. They may easily bring with them a continual undermining of the doctrine of the Church.

We believe that the present crisis in our Church does not only depend on the aforesaid decision. It may be seen as the result of a long-continued disintegration of Church doctrine whose most considerable cause is a theology—in Swedish "folkkyrkotanken"—whose unbiblical development identifies people and Church. Another cause is the common hypothesis that the development of Society is of decisive importance for the Church even in doctrinal questions.

We are obliged lastly to declare, that the decision will both damage ecumenical relations of our Church and leave the problem of the service of women in the Church unsolved.

We are very well aware of the scruples that the decision of the Kyrkomöte has caused among many, priests as well as laymen. We believe nevertheless that it is possible still to remain in the Swedish Church. The Church still exists where the word of God is rightly preached and where the Sacraments are administered according to the institution of Christ. The Ministry still functions where it is given and received according to the order of Christ. The unbelief of men cannot bring God's faithfulness to naught.

We exhort all faithful to remain within the doctrine of the Apostolic and Catholic Church and in words and action clearly to reject the heresy now arisen.

We desire in this current matter of women's service in the Church, that the proposals of the Kyrkomöte concerning lay activity shall be put into effect as soon as possible: likewise, that the lay ministry of deacons and deaconesses shall find its proper place within the framework of the Church. Many women, trained for Church work, are prevented by their fidelity to the Confession of the Church, from accepting ordination to the priesthood, and so have still as small opportunity to serve officially in the Church as before the Kyrkomöte of 1958.

Finally a word to those many, priests and laymen who in deep grief have witnessed the recent developments in our Church. Let them not despair. The pastoral vocation that has been once bestowed in ordination, and, likewise, the obligation and blessing to faith and life in the Apostolic tradition that has been once conferred in baptism, is still valid for them. The situation of the Church calls for our self-examination, penitence and amendment. Our fidelity has often been defective. But it is perhaps the will of God that through the present crisis we shall work His work and lead the Catholic faith to a new victory within our Church, even among those who are not now aware of its richness and of its obligations.

From January 1960 the minimum subscription to **FAITH AND UNITY** will be 5/-.

From this issue the periodical will not be published **before** 15th of the month of publication. The next issue (Winter) will be out **after** 15th January

Communications for the Editor, and Annual Subscriptions, which may begin at any time, should be sent to the Publications Secretary, 6 Hyde Park Gate, London, S.W.7.